

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

56-2073

JUN 5

1956

MEMORANDUM FOR: Assistant Deputy Deputy (Support)

SUBJECT: Administrative Planning Policy

1. At a meeting on 1 June 1956 to consider measures for expediting the publication of proposed Regulations [ ] the ADD/S requested that a memorandum be prepared setting forth basic points on which policy guidance is desired as prerequisite for the development of acceptable text for such regulations. This is the requested memorandum.

2. There are four major areas in which guidance is requested. These are:

(i) What is the fundamental purpose of an Administrative Plan? Confidential Funds Regulation 9.4 (a)(2) explicitly provides that Administrative Plans will develop "policies and procedures which will insure optimum standards of sound administration compatible with the operational circumstances of each specific project." The draft version of [ ] prepared by PAFB and circulated for concurrence by ECS in December 1955, retains this language, which, in the view of PAFB, is essential to reflect the fundamental objective of the administrative planning process. Inherent in this concept is the view that Administrative Plans should treat not only of the relationships between CIA and project instrumentalities, but should also serve to define the respective responsibilities and authorities of interested Agency elements, where these cannot readily be determined by reference to existing regulations. On the other hand, the revised version of [ ] prepared by the Office of the SSA/DES in May 1956, is based on the premise that the quoted language is so vague as to be misleading and productive of unnecessary controversy. Moreover, the revised draft is based on the theory that an Administrative Plan should be much more limited in scope than has been the practice in the past.

(ii) Who shall determine whether or not an Administrative Plan is needed for a particular project? Should this responsibility be vested solely in the DD/P, or his designee, as provided in the present Confidential Funds Regulation 9.4, or is some participation by the DD/S necessary to enable the DD/S properly to discharge his responsibilities to the DCI? Alternatives to present procedure would seem to be (1) assignment of sole responsibility for this determination to the DD/S; (2) a joint determination by the DD/P and the DD/S; or (3) a requirement that the determination made by DD/P have, in each instance, concurrence by DD/S. In this matter, of course, any change from present procedure implies that the DD/S, or his designee, shall be afforded an opportunity to review all clandestine activities, including some which we

~~SECRET~~~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

25X1

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

JOB NO. BOX NO. FILE NO. DOC. NO. 26 NO CHANGE  
IN CLASS/ DECLASS/ CLASS CHANGED TO: [ ]  
NEXT REV DATE: 14 FEB 1957  
NO. REV. 14 FEB 1957  
CREATION DATE - ORG COMP 30 OF 30 ORG CLASS S  
REV CLASS - REV COORD. - AUTH: HR 703

CONFIDENTIAL

-2-

understand are not now submitted to him for review.

(iii) The recently adopted concept that administrative officers of line divisions shall participate more fully in Administrative Plan development needs further clarification. As matters now stand this policy could be construed to require area divisions to prepare a draft Administrative Plan in every case, or, in the alternative, could permit them to request the preparation of such a text by the Project Administrative Planning Staff. Furthermore, the extent of coordination now to be required, both within a Division, and among other interested Agency elements, is unclear. Are Administrative Plans to be coordinated in the same manner as heretofore, or, if not, in what particulars are present coordination procedures to be altered? Lastly, the function and authorities of the Project Administrative Planning Staff in this new concept need careful definition.

25X1A (iv) Proposed Regulation  would govern small subsidy projects--except when this would be impracticable, in which case an Administrative Plan would be prepared. This regulation also provides standardized administrative controls suitable for incorporation by reference in Administrative Plans for proprietary and large subsidy projects. PAPS believes both these concepts--but particularly the latter--to be undesirable. Hence, it is necessary to inquire whether it is desirable to provide by regulation for various Administrative Plan features which occur at more or less frequent intervals. If so, should such a regulation establish standardized procedures for all proprietary and subsidy projects, from which relief can be secured via the administrative planning process? Or, on the other hand, should a regulation by its terms be limited to projects, such as smaller subsidies, which can be demonstrated to require substantially similar administrative procedures in a majority of cases?

CONFIDENTIAL